

are satisfied with the childcare they are providing, but by whatever Washington bureaucrats determine to be appropriate measures of performance.

I am not sure why Washington bureaucrats are better suited than parents to identify quality childcare providers, but as the Democrat candidate for the Governor of Virginia recently made clear, Democrats do not seem to think that parents are best suited to make decisions for their children.

Mr. President, I can go on. I can talk about the confusing government bureaucracy parents will have to navigate under the Democrats' new childcare program, or I can talk about the fact that this new childcare benefit could drive up childcare costs for middle-class families over the next 3 years by a staggering \$13,000 a year, according to one estimate. Yeah, \$13,000 a year.

But, today, what I really want to emphasize is something Democrats conveniently omit from discussions of their new government programs, and that is, as I said, that with government money comes government control. Democrats are setting the stage for a government takeover of childcare, where you can choose your provider only as long as Democrats agree with your choice.

ABORTION

Mr. President, before I close, I want to mention one other aspect of the Democratic bill, and that is the bill's commitment to taxpayer funding of abortion.

While the Democratic Party has long supported an abortion agenda, there has at least been bipartisan agreement when it comes to appropriations bills that we are not going to use taxpayer dollars to fund abortion.

For decades—decades, going back to the 1980s—the Hyde amendment and other riders have helped prevent taxpayer dollars from paying for abortions. No longer, if Democrats have their way.

In the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree, taxpayer funding of abortions is the order of the day. Restrictions on the use of taxpayer dollars for abortion funding are omitted, and in at least one case, Democrats actively require funding of abortion and would override State laws on insurance coverage of abortion.

Let's be very clear. This bill is a slap in the face to every American who believes in the sanctity of human life and doesn't want his or her tax dollars going to pay for killing unborn human beings.

You would think that if we can't agree that the human rights of unborn children should be protected, we could at least agree that taxpayers shouldn't be forced to pay for killing unborn children.

Well, apparently, even that is too much to ask for Democrats, even though nearly 60 percent of Americans oppose having their tax dollars go to abortion. That's right, almost 60 per-

cent of Americans do not want their tax dollars going to pay for abortions.

But that doesn't seem to matter to the Democratic Party, which is squarely in the pocket of the radical abortion lobby. The Democrats' legislation contains a radical commitment to government funding of abortions against the wishes of the majority of the American people.

It is just one more reason why the Build Back Better plan is a bad deal for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). The Senator Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. CARPER. Thanks very much.

Mr. President, I don't have enough time to respond to everything that my colleague from South Dakota has said. If I did, it would take a long while.

I would say this: A couple of years ago, when we passed with only Republican votes in the House and Senate, signed by President Trump, a tax-cut bill that was supposed to pay for itself, it didn't. It increased our deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars.

I think most of us know, with respect to abortion, the law of the land for many years—over 30 years—has been *Roe v. Wade*; and, essentially, after a certain point, when you have viability in the womb, abortions cannot be performed except in very limited cases, including rape, incest, and the life of the mother.

The legislation that we passed and considered in the House does not provide for changing those limitations, and that needs to be made clear.

The other thing I would say, with respect to the reconciliation bill, the Build Back Better legislation that the House is considering today in the Rules Committee, it is paid for. It is actually paid for, and it is paid for largely by making sure that everybody is paying their fair share.

Folks don't mind in my State—and other States don't mind—you know, seeing their taxes raised, but they want to make sure that everybody else is paying their fair share. As it turns out, there are a lot of wealthy people in this country and a lot of wealthy corporations who don't pay their fair share—in some cases nothing—and that is just wrong.

And the legislation actually cuts taxes for most Americans.

VOTE ON CONNOR NOMINATION

Mr. President, now to the issue at hand. We are about to vote today on the nomination of Michael Connor to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

As we all know, this is a critical leadership position for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers Civil Works program is the nation's primary provider of water resources infrastructure, and with the increasing impacts of climate change,

having someone of Mr. Connor's caliber at the Corps is critical.

He has the experience and character to be successful in this role. During the Obama administration, he served as Deputy Secretary of the Interior, and he proved himself to be a capable leader. He will bring that experience to the Corps.

If confirmed, Mr. Connor will lead efforts that dramatically impact every corner of this country, from coastal to inland to small, disadvantaged, rural, and Tribal communities.

It is critically important that we get Mr. Connor confirmed now, today. I urge my colleagues to support his nomination.

I think my time has expired.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the Connor nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Lee Connor, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

VOTE ON CONNOR NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Connor nomination?

Mr. CARPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been called for.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

(Mr. PETERS assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. SCHATZ assumed the Chair.)

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 463 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Baldwin	Crapo	Lankford
Barrasso	Daines	Leahy
Bennet	Duckworth	Lee
Blackburn	Durbin	Lujan
Blumenthal	Ernst	Lummis
Blunt	Feinstein	Manchin
Booker	Fischer	Markey
Boozman	Gillibrand	McConnell
Braun	Graham	Menendez
Brown	Grassley	Merkley
Burr	Hagerty	Moran
Cantwell	Hassan	Murkowski
Capito	Heinrich	Murphy
Cardin	Hickenlooper	Murray
Carper	Hirono	Ossoff
Casey	Hoeven	Padilla
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Peters
Collins	Inhofe	Portman
Coons	Kaine	Reed
Cornyn	Kelly	Risch
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Romney
Cotton	King	Rosen
Cramer	Klobuchar	Rubio